



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/975,084	10/12/2001	Iko Knyphausen	004832.00068	7677

22907 7590 06/23/2005

BANNER & WITCOFF
1001 G STREET N W
SUITE 1100
WASHINGTON, DC 20001

EXAMINER

SERROU, ABDELALI

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2654

DATE MAILED: 06/23/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/975,084

Applicant(s)

KNYPHAUSEN ET AL.

Examiner

Abdelali Serrou

Art Unit

2654

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 13 October 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/12/2002</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 1 and 3-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Tarumi et al. (issued on June 29, 1999).

3. As per claim 1, Tarumi et al. teach a workflow monitoring system (Fig. 9, element 90), comprising: a program manager that divides a project into subprojects and that assigns resources to the subprojects (col. 11, lines 22-24), said program manager having predefined templates (i.e. delete, collect, move, add person, Fig. 11) by which to model the project.

4. As per claim 3, Tarumi et al. teach a system that discloses an editing system (Fig. 19, element 180), which a user or an editor can use to edit the subproject.

5. As per claims 4 and 5, Tarumi et al. teach a system wherein the program manager and the subproject reside within the same computer (col. 11, line 21) or different computers (col. 11, lines 17-18).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Tarumi et al. (issued on June 29, 1999) in view of Lakritz (U.S 6,623,529 filed on January 28, 1999 and issued on September 23, 2003).

Tarumi et al. teach a workflow monitoring system (see rejection of claim 1).

However, Tarumi et al. do not teach a system wherein the resources include translators.

Lakritz, however, teaches a system wherein the resources include translators (col. 12, line 38), and a “website manager” that update the language content of documents (col. 2, lines 21-22). Thus, an editor is necessarily embedded in the system.

Tarumi et al. and Lakritz are analogous art because they are from the same art of workflow management system.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added lakritz’s translation feature to the workflow management system of Tarumi et al., in order to provide a system that can be used by users from different parts of the world, speaking different languages.

Art Unit: 2654

8. As per claim 6, Tarumi et al. teach

- A system for receiving electronic information (col. 24, lines 11-15);
- A “work progress strategical model” (col. 14, lines 19-20) that predicts the required time to process a project and assigns resources to the project based on the estimate time to process the job (Fig. 3, element 33). Therefore, the system used, necessarily, determines the characteristics of the job (file). Otherwise, the system would not be able to estimate the period of time necessary to process a job.

However, Tarumi et al. do not teach a translation system that calculates the translation rate based on the characteristics of the received electronic files to estimate the translation time.

Lakritz, however, teaches a translation system (see rejection of claim 2).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have added the translation system of Lakritz to the work progress strategical model of Tarumi et al. in order to provide a system that processes multilingual documents.

9. As per claims 7 and 8, since Tarumi et al. teach a system that predicts the required time to process a project or a file, it is obvious that the steps of determining the size of the file and the number of words is disclosed. Otherwise, the system could not give time estimation to the user.

10. As per claim 9, if a system does perform the limitations as described in claim 6, the system would, necessarily, disclose a translation memory to match the electronic files with in order to provide documents translation. The rest of the limitations is rejected for the same reasons as set for the rejection of claim 6.

11. As per claim 10, Tarumi et al. do not teach a first display portion showing a project name; a second display portion showing at least one subproject associated with the project; a third display portion showing at least one resource assigned to said subproject for working on said subproject; and, a fourth display portion displaying the status of the work of said resource on said subproject. However, Tarumi et al. teach a display system showing multiple portions such as "Job Content", "Predicted Period Required", "Deadline", and "Referential Order" (Fig. 3, element 33).

The examiner takes official notice that it's well known to have a display system that displays multiple portions of the workflow. Therefore, it would have been to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention that for a project manager system to have a user interface comprising the features described above.

12. As per claim 11, teach a user interface that displays a graphical representation and a textual representation of the status of said work (Fig. 17 and Col. 22, lines 35-40).

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Goeser (U.S 6,138,088) teaches a method and apparatus for the computer-backed control of business processes and process sequences using natural language processing.

Wakisaka et al. (U.S 5,917,944) teach a translating system that calculates translation rate

Art Unit: 2654

representing the translation precision or information corresponding to the language type. Lakritz (U.S 6,526,426) teaches a translation management system in a computer environment.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Abdelali Serrou whose telephone number is 571-272-7638. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Talivaldis I. Smits can be reached on 571-272-7628. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

15. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Abdelali Serrou
06/21/2005

A.K. AS
6/21/05